

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,364	08/22/2003	Jere R. Anderson	T0428.70146US00	8634
7590 12/01/2006			EXAMINER	
Timothy J. Oyer, Ph.D.			KUHNS, ALLAN R	
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.				
600 Atlantic Avenue			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Boston, MA 02210			1732	
			DATE MAILED: 12/01/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
0.65	10/646,364	ANDERSON ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Allan Kuhns	1732			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	opears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING [- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC .136(a). In no event, however, may a re d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT tte, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed "HS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18.	September 2006.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-58 and 76-106</u> is/are pending in the	ne application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-58 and 76-106</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyand	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	= 1				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri	•	received in this National Stage			
application from the International Bures	, , , ,				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies not r	eceived.			
		•			
Attachment(s)	, □	(DTO 442)			
1)		ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	· =	formal Patent Application			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)	- •			

Application/Control Number: 10/646,364 Page 2

Art Unit: 1732

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2.Claims 1-19, 23-36 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noel et al. (5,904,965) as set forth in the previous Office action.
- 3.Claims 20-22, 37-39, 41-58 and 76-106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dumbauld (5,070,111).
- 4.Applicants' arguments filed September 18, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants assert that it appears that the water absorption testing described in Noel and Dumbauld was conducted without any vacuum being applied. Applicants then argue that, in the context of the present application, "complete submersion water absorption" is measured by completely immersing an entire sample in water under high vacuum and that the absence of vacuum in the testing described by Noel and Dumbauld would be expected to lead to significantly lower water absorption values as compared to values measured with applied vacuum. This is not persuasive because the instant claim language requires "complete submersion" and the Noel reference describes use of enough water to "completely submerse" each sample at column 19, lines 2 and 3, and it is submitted that "immersing" as used by Dumbauld at column 3, line 47 would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art as requiring complete submersion.

Applicants also sees no reason why the claimed U-test water absorption would have been met in Dumbauld, particularly since the water absorption appears to have been done without any vacuum applied. But it is noted by the examiner that the claims at issue require "a U-test". One reason why Dumbauld's sample would meet the U-test requirement is that the ends of the sample are not submerged in conducting this test. In addition, Dumbauld notes at column 3, lines 48-50 that use of a foam with a high number of closed cells leads to low values of water absorption.

5.**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6.Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allan Kuhns whose telephone number is (571) 272-1202. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:00 to 5:30.

Application/Control Number: 10/646,364 Page 4

Art Unit: 1732

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson, can be reached on (571) 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALLAN R. KUHNS PRIMARY EXAMINER AU 1732